MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
19 June 1969
INDEX

		Page
1.	Date of Next Meeting	1
2.	Approval of Minutes of April Meeting	1
3.	Summer Personnel	1
4.	Additional Street Lighting, Independence Avenue and Tenth Street, S.W., L'Enfant Plaza Corporation	1-2
SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS		
1.	D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development	
	a. Shipstead-Luce Act	
	(1) S.L. 69-60, 1401 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. - Proposed Office Building on Site of Willard Hotel	2-3
	(2) S.L. 69-58, 801 Market Space, N.W. - Proposed Office Building	2-3
	(3) S.L. 69-41, 1740 New York Ave., N.W.	2-3
2.	D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency	
	a. Selection of Architectural Coordinator for Fort Lincoln	3
	b. Fort Lincoln Elementary School - Revised Design	3-4
	c. Town Center Park, Eye St. Between 3rd and 6th Sts.,S.W.	4
	d. Southwest Pepco Substation No. 18 - Revised Design	4
3.	D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds	
	Bruce-Monroe Elementary School Replacement	4
4.	Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers	
	a. Fort Myer, Va. Interfaith Chapel	5
	b. Relocation of: Wall, Arlington National Cemetery, Old Horseshow Grounds	5
	c. Army Mutual Aid Building, Fort Myer	5

5. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in Health Sciences, National Institutes of Health 5

6. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

Electrical Substation for Subway 6

7. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

a. South Carolina Tricentennial Medal 6

b. Alabama 150th Anniversary Medal 6

c. Medal Commemorating the 100th Anniversary of the City of Wichita 6

8. Department of the Army, Institute of Heraldry

Appollo Moon Lapel Button 6

IV. LEGISLATION 6-7

V. INTERVIEWS

1. Redevelopment Land Agency

a. Selection of Architectural Coordinator for Fort Lincoln 7-8

b. Fort Lincoln Elementary School 8

c. Town Center Parks, Eye St. bet. 3rd and 6th Sts.S.W. 8-9

d. Southwest Pepco Substation No. 18 9

2. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Bruce-Monroe Elementary School Replacement, Georgia Ave. and Irving St., N.W. 9

3. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

a. Fort Myer, Va. Interfaith Chapel 9-10

b. Army Mutual Aid Building 10

4. GSA, Public Buildings Service

John E. Fogarty International Center 10

5. *D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development*

a. *S.L. 69-60, 1401 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.* *10*

b. *S.L. 69-58, 801 Market Space, N.W.* *10*

c. *S.L. 69-59, 1740 New York Ave., N.W.* *10*

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

A regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on 19 June 1969. The members met, pursuant to notice, in executive session at 10:20 a.m. with William Walton, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Kevin Roche
Hideo Sasaki
Chloethiel Woodard Smith
John Walker

Staff: Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
M. Lawrence Luskey
Nancee W. Black
Myra Younker
NCPC: David McKinnon
Reporter: Doyne Spencer

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday, 17 September 1969, was approved as the date of next meeting. Any additional meetings, if necessary, would be held in New York City.

2. Approval of Minutes of April Meeting

The minutes of the April meeting were approved.

3. Summer Personnel (Added)

The Secretary introduced Daniel Reiff, William Thompson, and Ellen Schwartz who will again assist in the Georgetown Survey. Churches and schools will be recorded, as well as several old houses.

4. Informal Inquiry - Additional Street Lighting, Independence Avenue and Tenth Street, S.W., L'Enfant Plaza Corporation

The Secretary Stated that General Quesada of the L'Enfant Plaza Corporation had requested the Commission's advice about replacing the lighting standards along Independence Avenue with standards of the same design as those of the Tenth Street Mall and L'Enfant Plaza. His proposal had been discussed with Araldo Cossutta, his architectural consultant.

He felt the intersection should be more clearly defined to attract people to the Tenth Street Mall and L'Enfant Plaza.

The members recognized the problem but thought any change in the design of the lighting standards or increase in the number of them would not solve the problem which exists during the daytime as well as at night. They recommended that the L'Enfant Corporation obtain the services of a professional to study the problem.

The Commission's recommendation was reported to General Quesada.
EXHIBIT A

III. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

The Secretary presented and reviewed the following projects.

1. D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development

a. Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) S.L. 69-60, 1401 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. - Proposed Office Building on Site of Willard Hotel, Vlastimil Koubek, architect.

(2) S.L. 69-58, 801 Market Space, N.W.- Proposed Office Building, Karl Kaufman, architect.

A model os the Market Space office building and drawings of both the above projects indicated a conflict with the Pennsylvania Avenue Plan. The Market Space office building conflicted with the site designated for the proposed Woodrow Wilson memorial and "market square" as established in the Avenue Plan. The office building proposed for the Willard Hotel site conflicted with plans for the National Square.

The owners of the Hotel had consulted the Corporation Counsel who advised the Mayor that he could issue a permit to construct the office building against the objections of the Commission of Fine Arts. The Counsel maintained that the Commission should confine its advice to the exterior design of buildings and not to compare them with the design established by the Pennsylvania Avenue Plan since in his opinion the Plan had no validity. Apparently, he had not taken into consideration that the area within the Pennsylvania Avenue Plan had been declared a National Historic Site.

The members agreed to reject the designs for both buildings on the basis of their conflicting with the Avenue Plan. An interview with the architects was deemed necessary for the record.

(3) S.L. 69-41, 1740 New York Avenue, N.W. - Proposed Office Building for United Unions, the Cosgrove-Caffee Associates, architects.

A model and drawings indicated a concrete structure. According to the architect property line restriction prevented siting the building on axis with Rawlins Park, thus resulting in a very awkward relationship.

Briefly discussing this problem, the members agreed that it would be reasonable to request a series of volume studies exploring the possibility of reorienting the building by setting back the west elevation. The importance of the site required that the building be given much additional study.

Action was withheld until a conference with the architect later.

(4) Appendix 1

There were no objections to the recommendations by the staff on the Shipstead-Luce Applications listed on Appendix 1.

EXHIBIT B

b. Old Georgetown Act

There were no objections to the actions taken on the Old Georgetown Applications listed on Appendix 2. EXHIBIT C

2. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

a. Selection of Architectural Coordinator for Fort Lincoln

The Redevelopment Land Agency had accepted the Commission's recommendation that an architectural coordinator be selected for Fort Lincoln. The Agency wanted the Commission to suggest architects who the members considered were qualified for the job.

The members agreed that it was not appropriate for the Commission to make such recommendations and decided that RLA should propose a list of qualified architects and make their own selection of a coordinator. Further discussion was withheld until a conference with officials of RLA.

b. Fort Lincoln Elementary School - Revised Design, Fry and Welch, architects.

Instead of a dense concentration of relatively high buildings on top of the hill, the new plan called for the reconstruction of the old fort which would serve as a major open space joining the community facilities and the new school. Several main circulation routes would focus on this open space, including one through the school structure itself. Adjusted to the hilly terrain the school plan included craft shops, gymnasium, swimming pool, and "learning centers" on various levels. (Conventional classrooms were replaced by the "centers).

Although the school was scheduled for completion by next fall, the

members felt it necessary to discuss with RLA officials the need for an architectural coordinator before discussing any designs within this area. They maintain this project offers an opportunity to develop an excellent plan. To accomplish this an architectural coordinator is essential in order to attain a sense of unity and cohesiveness in the design of the entire project.

Action was withheld until a conference with representatives of RLA and the architect.

c. Town Center Park, Eye Street between 3rd and 6th Streets, S.W. Revised Design, Wallace, McHarg, Roberts and Todd, architects.

A model and drawings revealed the architects attempt to comply with the Commission's recommendations to simplify the design and to reinforce the relation to the major urban center immediately to the south.

There was some difference of opinion as to whether the design was better or worse than the previous submission. But final decision on the overall design was withheld pending conference with RLA and architect. There was unanimous feeling about one feature however: that the reuse of the old McMillan Fountain, which has been in storage many years, was completely inappropriate as the central vertical element of the composition.

Action was withheld until a conference with the architect.

d. Southwest Pepco Substation No. 18 - Revised Design. Keyes, Lethbridge and Condon, architects.

Due to a lack of clarity in the two models presented, the members deferred further discussion until conferring with the architect.

3. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Bruce-Monroe Elementary School Replacement, Georgia Avenue and Irving Street, N.W. Ronald S. Senseman, architect.

A model, site and floor plans indicated a 3-story school having four learning centers or classroom areas, octagonal in shape, separated by stairwells. Horizontal circulation was minimized. A 2-story all purpose room was planned at the center. Mechanical equipment was located above it. The plan had been approved by the Mayor, school board, faculty, and neighborhood.

The members considered the plan acceptable for today's school programs but felt it was not expressed well. The design was complicated with too many elements.

Action was withheld until a conference with the architect.

4. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

a. Fort Myer, Va., Interfaith Chapel - Proposed Design. Johnson and Boutin, architects; Pietro Belluschi, consultant.

A model, site plan and drawings were submitted for an interfaith chapel with ancillary space for Sunday school rooms, assembly room, space for the choir, etc.

The members commented that the plan appeared "ill proportioned" and the design "mannered" and "inappropriate." Separating the chapel from the ancillary functions was suggested and had been considered by the architects. But apparently, according to the Secretary, the Army was reluctant to do this since budget restrictions might result in eliminating one or the other major components of the program.

The members agreed that the design could not be approved but withheld action until a conference with the architects and representatives of the Department of the Army.

b. Relocation of:

(1) Wall, Arlington National Cemetery, Old Horseshow Grounds

(2) Proposed Closing of Arlington Ridge Road and Relocation of the Sheridan Gate.

The members approved the above projects which had been proposed in the master plan for the Cemetery.

The Commission's approval was forwarded to the Department of the Army. EXHIBIT D

c. Army Mutual Aid Building, Fort Myer - Proposed Design. Wilkes and Faulkner, architects.

A model and drawings indicated a design of an addition to a brick building typical of Fort Myer. The 3-story structure was not a part of the central composition of the base. The members had no objection to the design. A conference with the architect was considered unnecessary and cancelled.

The Commission's action was forwarded to the Department of the Army. EXHIBIT E

5. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in Health Sciences, National Institutes of Health - Proposed Design. Hellmuth, Obata and Kassabaum, architects.

A self-contained conference complex consisting of offices, living quarters, conference and lecture rooms, and cafeteria were planned.

The site on the NIH campus had been previously approved by the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts.

Although some members had no objection to the plan, others felt it was too complicated and should be simplified. They decided to discuss it with the architect later.

6. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

Electrical Substation for Subway, Rock Creek Park and Belmont Road - Proposed Design. Harry Weese and Associates, architects.

The members approved a design for a semi-underground structure with the roof conceived as a pedestrian overlook with plantings.

The Commission's action was forwarded to the Washington Area Transit Authority. EXHIBIT F

7. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

a. South Carolina Tricentennial Medal- Proposed Design

The members approved the design prepared by Enrique Monjo of Barcelona, Spain.

b. Alabama 150th Anniversary Medal - Proposed Design

The members disapproved the design proposed by the Alabama Sesquicentennial Commission.

c. Medal Commemorating the 100th Anniversary of the City of Wichita - Confirmation of Action

The members' disapproval of the design proposed by the Bureau of the Mint was confirmed.

The Commission's action on the above medals was forwarded to the Bureau of the Mint. EXHIBIT G

8. Department of the Army, Institute of Heraldry

"Apollo" Moon Lapel Button - Confirmation of Action

The members had no objection to the design. The Institute of Heraldry was informed. EXHIBIT H

IV. LEGISLATION

1. S.J. Res. 94-4/18/69-Mr. Proxmire-91st C

To provide for a professional study of the feasibility of

restoring the west front of the Capitol, with particular attention to and analysis of the risk, cost, and disruption factors of a restoration project.

The members had no objection to the above legislation. A consulting firm selected by the National Advisory Panel on Architectural Services for GSA would conduct the study.

The Commission's action was reported to the Committee on Public Works. A report is to be prepared by the Secretary.

2. S.J. Res. 24-1/22/69-Mr. Jackson-91st C

To provide for the administration and development of Pennsylvania Avenue as a national historic site.

The members approved the enactment of the above legislation.

3. H.R. 10238-4/17/69-Mr.Arends-91st C

To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the removal of the Francis Asbury statue, and for other purposes.

The members approved the above legislation.

4. S.J. Res. 107-5/5/69-Mr.McCarthy-91st C (Added)

To authorize and direct the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Commission to raise funds for the construction of a memorial.

The members were opposed to this legislation which would provide for the construction of the design by Marcel Breuer, which had been disapproved by the Commission.

A report is to be prepared by the Secretary.

V. INTERVIEWS

1. Redevelopment Land Agency

Mr. Sherman and Mr. Mays represented the RLA during the discussion of the following projects.

a. Selection of Architectural Coordinator for Fort Lincoln

Mr. Walton stated that the Commission could not recommend anyone as architectural coordinator.

Mr. Mays explained in detail the duties of the coordinator who would

"establish the general design criteria" in which developers could work, be responsible for the design of public open spaces, street furniture, graphics, etc.; and be responsible for all "coordination of private and public developers and the relationship between the two."

The members stressed that the coordinator should be someone known to be competent in establishing the architecturalcharacter for an area and in directing others to achieve this plan. They agreed that RLA was proceeding in the right direction in obtaining an architectural coordinator.

Because of the importance of the Fort Lincoln development, the transcripts pertaining to the selection of an architectural coordinator and to the design of the school are submitted for the record.

EXHIBIT I

b. Fort Lincoln Elementary School - Revised Design

Mr. Lewis Fry, architect attended the meeting. Mr. Mays explained the program for Fort Lincoln, the time schedule which included completion of the school by September 1970, and the numerous other problems involved in a project of this size. With these factors, RLA undertook the role of design coordinator, relating the design of the school to the surrounding area, with the hope that a selected design coordinator could then continue the program with the design of the school as guide for other projects in the area.

Mr. Sherman spoke on the configuration of the building which was based on land use, circulation pattern and topography. These factors were constants in the project with or without a coordinator.

Mr. Fry commented on the plan for the school pointing out the pedestrian accessibility, school circulation system and community facilities of the project. In reply to a question pertaining to the roof areas, he commented that they would be used and landscaped.

The members decided to take the project under advisement. Later during a closed session, the members agreed that to prevent delay in the program they would waive their objections to the design for the school. This action was reported to RLA with the notice that the Commission would not review any other project for Fort Lincoln area until an architectural coordinator was retained.

The Commission's action was forwarded to RLA. EXHIBIT J

c. Town Center Parks, Eye Street between 3rd and 6th Sts.,S.W. Revised Design.

Speaking for the members, Mr. Sasaki stated that the trees should be rearranged to open up the park and to relate to the other areas. Since funds prevented erecting a fountain and the members

disapproved the re-use of the McMillan fountain, they recommended a large pool. Otherwise the proposal was acceptable.

The Commission's approval and recommendations were forwarded to RLA. EXHIBIT K

d. Southwest Pepco Substation No. 18 - Revised Design

Mr. Condon, architect, attended the meeting.

Since the model and drawings were confusing the members asked numerous questions pertaining to the location of the transformer cage, space for operating control rooms and the surrounding stone retaining wall. The architect was unable to satisfactorily answer them either by illustrating on the model or on the drawings.

Mr. Roche suggested that a model be presented that shows exactly what is proposed. The members agreed.

The Commission's disapproval, with this suggestion, was forwarded to RLA. EXHIBIT L

2. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Bruce-Monroe Elementary School Replacement, Georgia Avenue and Irving St., N.W. - Proposed Design

Mr. Richardson of the Department of Buildings and Grounds and Mr. Senseman, architect, attended the meeting.

Speaking for the members, Mr. Bunshaft stated that the basic concept was interesting but the design "unnecessarily complicated." He suggested that it be treated as "one mass from the ground up" to get four simple strong sections with some sculptural element for the stairs to link them together. "If done right and well proportioned" the design for four octagonals and four verticals "could be very handsome."

Acknowledging that the design appeared overdone, the architect agreed to restudy the basic concept.

The Commission's views were reported to the Department of General Services. EXHIBIT M

3. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

a. Fort Myer, Va. Interfaith Chapel - Proposed Design'

Mr. Weber of the Department of the Army and Mr. Johnson and Mr. Boutin, architects, attended the meeting.

Mr. Bunshaft expressed the members' unanimous disapproval of the plan and design. He commented that the chapel should be separated from the ancillary services. It should be designed as a chapel and not "set as a tepee on top of an ordinary base."

The Commission's disapproval was forwarded to the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers.

EXHIBIT N

b. Army Mutual Aid Building, Fort Myer - Proposed Design

Cancelled.

4. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

John E. Fogarty International Center of Advanced Study in the Health Sciences, National Institutes of Health - Proposed Design

Mr. Obata, architect, attended the meeting.

Speaking for the members, Mr. Roche commented that the concept of creating a small village for the Center was acceptable but the numerous forms made the plan seem too complicated. The exterior was not as clearly stated as it should be. The Commission felt it should be restudied.

Mr. Bunshaft added that the idea of pavilions extending from the main hall was excellent but "the articulation of both the site plan and the detailed circulation should be stronger." Many of the interior spaces were also awkward.

The Commission's request that the plans be restudied was forwarded to General Services Administration. EXHIBIT O

5. D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development

a. S.L. 69-60, 1401 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. - Proposed Office Building on Site of Willard Hotel

Mr. Koubek, architect, attended the meeting. He briefly restated the fact that the private owner of the site, within the boundary of the proposed National Square, hoped to obtain an approval of the design for the building in order to receive a permit to raze the Willard Hotel and construct the building. Exterior materials would be pink granite or limestone and dark brown tinted glass. Mr. Walter Pozen, attorney for the owner, entered the conference late but made no statement for the record.

The members took the project under advisement.

b. S.L. 69-58, 801 Market Space, N.W. - Proposed Office Building

Mr. Gordon presented a written statement (EXHIBIT P) and requested the Commission to decide at this time whether or not any

building will be constructed on this site.

The members took the matter under advisement.

Later, in a closed session, the members unanimously approved Mr. Walton's statement that "the Commission of Fine Arts could not approve either one of these designs or recommend to the District officials that they be given permission to build "since they do not conform with designs the Commission had previously approved for Pennsylvania Avenue."

The Commission's disapproval of both designs and reasons for it were forwarded to the Department of Economic Development.

EXHIBITS Q and R

c. S.L.69-59, 1740 New York Avenue, N.W. - Proposed "United Unions" Office Building

Mr. Cosgrove, architect, attended the meeting.

Mrs. Smith speaking for the members stated that a series of studies should be made of the massing in relation to the park and surrounding structures.

Mr. Cosgrove's explanation of his design in relation to the site did not change the members' view. The problem remained unsolved.

The Commission's disapproval and request for a restudy of the project was forwarded to the Department of Economic Development.

The meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles H. Atherton

Charles H. Atherton, Secretary

19 June 1969

Dear Pete:

The Commission, as usual, is sympathetic with your problem of identifying the Tenth Street Mall entrance to L'Enfant Plaza. As things exist now, we imagine that day time identification is more important than night and therefore don't believe that a mere rearrangement of lighting fixtures would solve the problem.

Why not have one of your designers turn his talents toward solving the problem. I suspect that some kind of a sign will be necessary and there is no reason for there not to be one. The Commission does not want to recommend moving or replacing any of the light fixtures that form a sequence down Independence Avenue, but I will bet a way can be found to draw attention to this entrance.

Best wishes always,

William Walton
Chairman

Lt. General Elwood R. Quesada
990 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W.
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT A

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS 6/19/69

NO SL 69-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
56	515-20th St., NW Gewirz & Small	Material samples for proposed parking garage.

ACTION: App'd., provided constr. match sample sand-blasted panels erected on the site, & also sample submitted to the CFA's office. Request that panels on site be left for duration of job, 6/9/69.

Inf. 57	1740 New York Ave., NW United Unions, Inc.	New off. bldg. for United Unions, Inc.

ACTION: Superseded by SL 69-59, 6/19/69.

58	801 Market Space, NW Penn-Market Properties	New off. bldg. 12 stories plus sunken garden level containing restaurant.

ACTION: Disap'd. See attached ltr. dtd. 6/19/69 to Ch., Permit Br., Bur. of L&I, D. C. Dept. of ED, 6/19/69.

59	1740 New York Ave., NW United Unions, Inc.	New off. bldg. & model for United Unions, Inc.

ACTION: Disap'd. Request further study of bldg. massing & site relationship to vistas along the adjoining avenues, & from Rawlins Park to the west, 6/19/69.

60	1401 Penna. Ave., NW 1401 Realty Corp.	13-story & 4-cellar off. bldg. of precast conc. Resubm. of work prev. subm'd. on 5/12/ & 2/11/69. Drawings on file with CFA.

ACTION: Disap'd. See attached ltr. dtd. 6/19/69 to Ch., Permit Br., Bur. of L&I, D. C. Dept. of ED, 6/19/69.

APPENDIX 1

EXHIBIT B

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS

MAY 1 9 1969

NO SL 69-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
47	515-20th St., NW B.S. Gewirz & A. Small	Parking garage - Revised drawings & exterior material.

ACTION: No obj. to design, but request sample panels of exterior materials, prior to issuance of permit, for inspection by the Comm. Samples to incl. treatment of all elevations. The Comm. would like to emphasize the need for quality of appearance of materials due to the proximity to E St. & adjoining Federal bldgs. Has any consideration been given to the use of split-face or "Corduroy" concrete block as an alternate material, 5/6/69.

49	4155 Linnean Ave., NW Hillwood (M. M. Post)	7' X 7' wood guard station for main gate.

ACTION: Appd., 4/30/69.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS

JUN 2 1969

NO SL 69-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
50	801 Market Sp., NW Penn-Market Properties	12-story off. bldg. plus sunken garden level containing restaurant.

ACTION: Ret'd. for add'l. inf. Subms. for bldgs. in this important location should be accompanied by a scale model showing project in relation to surrounding areas, 5/23/69.

51	1341 E St., NW Whelan Drugs	3 s-f signs. Plexiglas panels with cut-out ltrs. No illumination from within. Exist. signs to be removed.

ACTION: Disap'd. Signs to be restricted to name of business. Names of products & brand names prohibited, 5/23/69.

52	1401 Penna. Ave., NW 1401 Realty Corp.	13-story & 4-cellar off. bldg. of precast concrete.

ACTION: Ret'd. for add'l. inf. Subms. for bldgs. in this important location should be accompanied by a scale model showing project in relation to surrounding areas, 5/23/69.

53	901 thru 947 - 6th St., SW Southwest #12 Corp.	Constr. 434 dwelling units, of which 414 units will be elevator served highrise apts. & 20 units will be single-fam. townhouses.

ACTION: App'd., 5/14/69.

54	310-1st St., SE Capitol Hill Associates, Inc.	4-story off. bldg., brick facing, painted white.

ACTION: App'd. Recom. painting new brick a light neutral color. Also recom. painting penthouse a slightly darker shade of the same color. Window framing to be white, 5/23/69.

55	300-1st St., SE Capitol Hill Club	Private Club

ACTION: Appd. Recom. painting new brick a light neutral color. Also recom. painting penthouse a slightly darker shade of the same color. Window framing to be white. Penthouse is to be a single mass as shown on drawings symmetrical with facade, 5/23/69.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS MAY 1 9 1969

NO OG 69-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
130	1665 Wisc. Ave., NW Randolph W. Reed, Jr.	Raze frame-with-brick-veneer-front sotre, 2 fls. in entirety. Not condemned by D. C. Gov't.
ACTION: Ret'd. for add'l. inf. Request rpt. on structural conditions & statement re. proposed razing as opposed to rehabilitating present structure. Also request opportunity for members of OG Board to inspect inside of premises, 4/23/69.		
131	1667 Wisc. Ave., NW	Same as OG 69-130.
150	3108 "O" St., NW Christ Church	Light over entr. with translucent glass.
ACTION: Recom'd., 4/30/69.		
151	1232-28th St., NW Richard Cassidy	Air-cond. unit on roof. Install duct work in attic.
ACTION: No obj., 5/6/69.		
152	3247 R St., NW Rev. & Mrs. A. R. Shands, III	Remove porch. Replace with new steps & platform, & railing. Small roof over door.
ACTION: Ret'd. for add'l. inf. Request plan & details of new stairway. No obj. to removal of porch, but recom. omission of new hood over elliptical arch, 5/6/69.		
153	1523-28th St., NW Stephen & Ellen Kurzman	Constr. trellis at rear of property for vine training. Modify alley gate at front of dwelling. (Trellis in place.)
ACTION: No obj. due to restricted public visibility of structure, 5/6/69.		

EXHIBIT C

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued) MAY 19 1969

NO OG 69-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
154	1735-32nd St., NW Dumbarton Oaks	Addn. to Director's Residence.
ACTION:	Recom'd. as revised. Request that brick on new wings match exist. bldg., 5/6/69.	
155	3021 "O" St., NW Peter I. Adolph	Install carriage lamp beside front door. Dimensions: 19"x12". Lamp area: 12"x6".
ACTION:	Recom'd., 5/6/69.	
156	2900 M St., NW Harygul India Imports, Inc.	Change text on 5 exist. s-f signs.
ACTION:	No obj., 5/6/69.	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS JUN 2 1969

NO OG 69-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
157	3273 M St., NW Dashtara Rugs	Install 1 set of cut-out s-f metal ltrs. on pins on front of bldg. Black ltrs. with white illumination.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Recom. use of all classical ltrs. of better design, 5/21/69.		
Inf. 158	1615-32nd St., NW Mr. E. J. Lackman	2nd story addn. (bedrm. & bath) on top of exist. 1-story wing in rear of property.
ACTION: Recom'd., 5/21/69.		
159	1300-30th St., NW Mrs Mary G. Dean	Constr. wall-fence & new door.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Terminate wall at southwest corner of house & substitute French doors for sliding door on west elevation, 5/21/69.		
160	1665 Wisc. Ave., NW Randolph W. Reed, Jr.	Raze.
ACTION: No obj. Recom. that new structure, to replace exist. bldg., conform in scale & general character to this portion of Wisc. Ave., 5/21/69.		
161	1667 Wisc. Ave., NW	Same as OG 69-160.
162	3247 R St., NW Rev & Mrs A.R. Shands, III	Revised drawings...remove exist. porch, new door & steps.
ACTION: Request add'l. inf. Show location of basem. areaway, character of treatment. Also recom. that new stair to front entr. be of brick, eliminating opening on front & extending wall to eliminate cantilever indicated on drawing. Request revised design, 5/21/69.		

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued) JUN 2 1969

NO OG 69-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
163	3250 K St., NW D. C. Gov't.	Raze 3-story brick & cinder-block bldg. for Highway constr. To be razed in entirety. Not condemned by D. C. Gov't.
ACTION: No obj., 5/21/69.		
164	3024 Cambridge Pl., NW Mr & Mrs Warren J. Cox	Addn. at rear of structure; fence around yard.
ACTION: Recom'd., 5/21/69.		
165	3271 M St., NW The Jean Jack	1 s-f, 24 sq-ft sign. Non-illuminated. Dark brown ltrs. on white bckgd. on wood.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Character of sign & proposed location on hood unsuitable. No obj. to placing sign inside bldg. back of showwindow, 5/21/69.		

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS 6/19/69

NO OG 69-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
166	3247 R St., NW Rev. & Mrs. A.R. Shands, III	Remove exist. porch & door sections. Replace with new step & door frame.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 6/18/69.	
167	1232 Potomac St., NW H. W. Porterfield	Brick veneer rear exist. bldg. Exterior changes only. Permit issued for interior.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 6/18/69.	

APPENDIX 2

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

JUL 1 1 1969

NO OG 69-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
168	3149 "O" St., NW Chas. H. Conner	5' wood picket fence.

ACTION: No obj., provided that fence be set back to line of adjoining bldg., that space between fence & sidewalk be planted with well developed shrubs or other suitable screen planting, & that fence incl. simple gate in matching material. Request sketch or photograph of gate for rcd., 6/24/69.

169	1432 Wisc. Ave., NW	antique gold canvas awning. No fixed iron frames or posts.
170	1436 Wisc. Ave., NW "Until Further Notice"	" " " " " " " " " "

ACTION: No obj., provided side panels & valence be omitted, 6/24/69.

171	3040 M St., NW Canal Sq. Associates	Remodel garage to provide for theaters on main fl. & restaurant on basem. level. Provide new canopy in side yard.

ACTION: No obj. as prel. scheme. Request detailed drawings showing dimensions of marquee & projecting awnings on Jefferson Pl., 6/24/69.

172	3007 Cambridge Pl., NW Mr & Mrs Philip Huber	Erect rear "open" trellis--has gone thru BZA.

ACTION: No obj., 6/24/69.

173	1027-33rd St., NW Decorators Walk	Replace exist. 4" ltrs. (using as many exist. ltrs. as possible) to spell "Decorators Walk."

ACTION: App'd., 6/24/69.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

JUL 2 2 1969

NO OG 69-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
174	3512 P St., NW T. A. Parrott	Install carriage lamp on front of house.
ACTION:	No obj., 7/9/69.	
176	1600 Avon Pl., NW Arthur C. Moore	Constr. dwelling.
ACTION:	Request further inf. on appearance of rear elevation. Question marked difference in character of this elevation in relation to elevations on Avon Pl. & Avon Le. Add'l. materials should incl. a simple model at a quarter or eighth scale, 7/9/69.	
70-1	1255 Wisc. Ave., NW Aged Woman's Home	Replace exist. damaged concrete steps with new brick steps. Design to be similar to exist. conditions.
ACTION:	No obj. Recom. selection of a dark red brick, 7/9/69.	
70-2	1661-35th St., NW Rose Marie Leverich	7' Cedar stockade fence.
ACTION:	No obj.	
70-3	2803 M St., NW Citizens Assn. of Georgetown	Fabricate, paint, letter & install 1 s-f plywood sign to masonry wall. Black ltrs. on white bckgd.
ACTION:	Recom'd. Suggest beaded molding or other edging device for sign panel, 7/9/69.	

July 3, 1969

Dear Mr. Robin:

This is merely to confirm the Commission of Fine Art's approval of the projects at Arlington Cemetery that we reviewed at our meeting on the 19th of June.

These projects included the closing of Arlington Ridge Road, the relocation of the existing wall adjoining Ridge Road near the old horse show grounds, and the relocation of Sheridan Gate.

All of these projects are in accordance with previously approved master plans.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. C. J. Robin, Chief
Engineering Division
Norfolk District, Corps of Engineers
Department of the Army
Fort Norfolk, 803 Front Street
Norfolk, Virginia 23510

EXHIBIT D

July 3, 1969

Dear Mr. Williams:

I am writing to confirm the Commission of Fine Art's approval of the additions to the Army Mutual Aid Building at Fort Myer, which the Commission reviewed at its meeting on June 19th.

In taking this action the Commission assumes that the addition will be made of materials matching the old building and the site will be adequately landscaped, especially in the areas adjoining the main highway and around the parking lot.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Howard M. Williams
Acting Chief, Engineering Division
Military Construction
Office of the Chief of Engineers
Department of the Army
Washington, D. C. 20315

EXHIBIT E

July 3, 1969

Dear General Graham:

This is merely to confirm the Commission of Fine Art's approval of designs for the electrical substation near Rock Creek Park and Belmont Road, N. W., which we reviewed at our meeting on the 19th of June.

Recessing the structure into the hillside and using the roof as a small pedestrian plaza is a good solution and should be repeated wherever possible.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Major General Jackson Graham
General Manager
Washington Metropolitan Area
Transit Authority
950 South L'Enfant Plaza, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20024

EXHIBIT F

11 July 1969

Dear Mrs. Brooks:

I am writing to confirm the Commission of Fine Arts action regarding the three medals submitted by the Mint for review at our June 19th meeting.

The Commission approved the designs for the Tricentennial Medal for the State of South Carolina. Of the three medals, this one at least had some measure of sculptural quality.

The other two -- 150th Anniversary Medal for the State of Alabama and the Medal Commemorating the 100th Anniversary of the City of Wichita -- are pathetic. So naive are they in conception that critical commentary is meaningless.

Unfortunately these two medals are not isolated cases. The Commission has reviewed over the last several years many medals of a similar calibre. The Commission has, of course, disapproved these medals but to no avail as they evidently were minted. We see no reason for this to continue as there are many highly qualified artists who, I am sure, are capable of outstanding work and I take this opportunity to urge that the Bureau of the Mint seek out and use this talent. As the Commission has stated many times before, medallic art can be one of the most enduring forms and the government and the people deserve something better than they have been getting.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Mary Brooks
Director, Bureau of the Mint
U.S. Treasury
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT G

9 July 1969

Dear Colonel Dundas:

This is to confirm my telephone conversation of June 19th reporting the Commission of Fine Arts approval of the Apollo Space Program lapel button.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Lt. Col. G. W. Dundas
Commanding Officer
The Institute of Heraldry
Cameron Station
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

EXHIBIT H

V. INTERVIEWS

3. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

(Fort Lincoln School - Proposed Design)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Sorry to speed you all up, but our business just got short, so we are hurrying you along. I think Mrs. Smith is going to address the first question to Mr. Purcell.

MR. PURCELL: Do you want me to present it first?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It will all come out.

MRS. SMITH: I think first we are a little at a loss without a total program. We don't have a program, and many questions came up. Each person brought them up on why certain things are done, and we thought it would be terribly helpful if we could have a program that explained the whole basic concept. We don't have that. Could you. --

MR. PURCELL: Well, I think -- should have a program, that is why I wanted to open it up to you folks. I want to

EXHIBIT H

open this up and discuss this project --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Talk louder, please.

MR. PURCELL: I want to open this up before having the architects. This job is Fort Lincoln; it is a new area where a considerable amount of housing is going to be located, and we have been assigned this job of design -- the Fort Lincoln Elementary School, from the pre-school kindergarten to the sixth grade, to have it ready even before, if possible, the housing is completely constructed. In the event that these apartments or houses are occupied ten at a time, the school will be ready. There is an intent to build another elementary school from the sixth on up, which would be called the junior high school and (senior) high school.

Now, we have nothing to look at, to consider, in this project as for masses or anything else, other than just apartments and duplex houses and things like that, which are on the board and not up far enough yet for us to make any reference to. So we say that this is just -- is being born by itself, and we have to work it in with the rest of the job, which the other two schools will come in two phases subsequent to this, and the housing is (tosses) --

MRS. SAARINEN: Mr. Purcell, I think we understand that state of the (job) to be going on now. This is apparently

some new concept in education. Who is responsible for that and how did that evolve? We are sort of lost.

MR. PURCELL: I was coming to that. This school is all open classroom studies. The educators participating in this, the community is participating in this, and certain committees are participating in this, which are telling the architect what kind of a classroom they want, how would it be fitted out, and what activities adjoin this classroom.

MR. ROCHE: Is this program in written form yet?

MR. PURCELL: Not too well as yet.

MR. ROCHE: No specifications as such?

MRS. SMITH: No diagrams?

MR. PURCELL: No diagrams, no nothing. This is from scratch.

MRS. SAARINEN: Is this teachers who are going to be teaching in it, School Board, or what?

MR. PURCELL: Educators teaching, principals in that area.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Since nobody lives in that area, I don't know what you mean.

MR. PURCELL: I am talking of this community in the surrounding areas, and also the school system, which have set up certain criteria for design of, let's say, a teaching center;

and they have some sort of idea and description that they have a (wet) area all the way around that classroom, and in the center will be 20 or 30 chairs or desks or things like that. That is as much as we have right now, and the architect has these people constantly over his shoulders working on these things -- it isn't cut and dried by any standards.

MRS. SMITH: Because it is a precedent, I think, in the whole new area, it is important that we understand the program.

MR. PURCELL: I agree with you. The other thing about it, I would like to say that the architect that has been charged to do this job -- well, when we (were) discussing the fees, we are even telling him to work Saturdays and Sundays and overtime - it has got to be (completed) with this school -- not telling you this because of the review of this -- that the construction is also loaded itself, so that this can open up in the year of 1970, in September.

MR. BUNSHAFT: How much money is this going to cost -- couple million dollars or million dollars?

MR. PURCELL: Yes, sir, it is.

((MR. FRY):) Four and a half million dollars.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You are going to get it built by next September?

(MR. FRY): Year's construction period has been set up.

MR. ROCHE: Now, the normal procedure would be to have an educational specification which then you work and you respond to that, and I gather you are not following that procedure in this?

MR. PURCELL: No, sir, it is all out. We find this is going to happen on all of our school designs from here on in. In fact, I have had one almost completed, with the criteria set, and the job was stopped, which I would like to have had this completed; but this falls first. The thing about it, Mrs. Smith, I would look at it this way: I don't think we could say it should normally cost $26 a square foot; if this, because of the accelerated construction, runs into $35, it is because -- (overlapped by next speaker).

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't understand. I wonder if we could ask the architect how you came about to have this formal shape, levels, etc. This is just in a general way; we are a little curious. Looks a little complicated to me. Is that the (community) or your whimsy?

MR. FRY: First of all, Mr. Fry, Sr., he is the proper (person) in this group and normally gives this presentation.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: For the record, state your name,

please.

MR. FRY: Louis Fry, Jr., F-r-y. We do have an educational consultant, General Learning Corporation. They are developing an educational specification program, unfortunately at the same time we are developing the building. We have, however, informal discussions going on, so that we are attuned to each other in terms of what we are trying to do; but the schematics, let's say, of presenting it at the same time that their educational program is presented to the School Board, etc., but they are setting the internal relationships and concepts, etc., which we are trying to implement.

But touching on your problem, I don't know how familiar you are with the entire concept, but it starts from this point (indicating map). This is our site here, and actually this is the beginning of the Town Center complex for Fort Lincoln. The general idea is to have an educational, recreational park kind of a proposition, winding throughout the center and, therefore, you would conclude at our particular site. In addition, this would be a mini-rail system running around here. There would be a stop at our site. This is the mini-rail system (indicating).

MRS. SAARINEN: What is the white thing next to it?

MR. FRY: This is a bridge connection that we are proposing between our complex and future off-site expansion of

this facility, and also a means of getting our kids over to this recreational park (design), because we have a street coming in here. Now this street that comes in here (indicating) is the street that serves this entire center, so our idea is to expand across this to (get the) kids out and associate them with the --

MR. BUNSHAFT: Which way are we looking here?

MR. FRY: This is the main feeder road, the proposed Eastern Avenue extension coming in here (indicating), and of course this is a dog leg off of it that serves the town center. This dog leg here would be this one (pointing to model). And we are bridging across that road to get to this area.

Now, this is programmed for future school expansion at this site, which is here (indicating). We are relating to that, and this is the recreational park (indicating).

Now, in addition, I would like to say this: This mini-rail system concept-wise was a part of the educational program -- that some of these students from this school might go to a school over here (indicating) by means of this inner-loop; and, therefore, access-wise, this mini-rail stop here was very important here in terms of bringing kids to our particular schools. And, therefore, we have related with this stop here, this being a recreation deck which is a part of the town center -- we have related that to a second level (general) learning center -

in essence to this, would be a main access from this direction as well as from below. Now, the immediate population to be served by the school would be this here (indicating), and RLA has created a pedestrian-way up from here, so this would be a (circumvation, circulation) in, and they are also talking about a mall development at the mini-rail stop -- you have a few stops - which would be a plaza.

MRS. SAARINEN: This is upside down -- in relation to this (indicating). This apartment building here is this one -- this is going downhill in this direction (indicating).

MR. BUNSHAFT: If you are standing in that green area looking up, which side would you see, this side (indicating)?

MR. ROCHE: You would see this from the main approach you have just described.

MRS. SAARINEN: In other words, the model is upside down in terms of the plan.

MR. ROCHE: But this approach you were describing just a moment ago would be looking up this way (indicating)?

MR. FRY: Yes, exactly. From the housing here (indicating), this would be the principal means of access to the school for these people on the low side, that would correspond to this direction (indicating).

MR. BUNSHAFT: Where is the mini-rail, right here?

So from down in here you wouldn't see the school. Is this down (indicating)?

MR. FRY: Oh, this is up. Actually, this complex that you see in here -- we are talking about here --

MR. BUNSHAFT: So this area here (indicating), you wouldn't see the (school) mall -- the school is on the other side. You say this is higher than this (indicating), but as you came through this pleasant life here, you would see this building rather than the school -- the school fronts toward the housing?

MR. FRY: Yes, sir, but I would like to add though that between our school and the end of this town center complex is this plaza, which is right here (indicating). Now, this strip in here, for instance -- this strip is the plaza strip -- or is the RLA proposal, and they propose to develop shops on this side, while we have welfare offices, community -- (inaudible) on our side, and together, they would constitute a plaza -- associated with the plaza.

MR. ROCHE: Why does this --

MR. FRY: This is shown at 60 feet, but this is nebulous. We go under our building with an extension of that thought, (to) widen that out.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Is the housing down the hill much or slightly down?

MR. FRY: Actually, with the cut in the grades being proposed by RLA, talking about a 10-foot differential.

MR. BUNSHAFT: And that housing is fairly level?

MR. FRY: No, I can show you that. This is the school site (indicating), if you can see it here; and you are talking basically about an existing 13 per cent grade in here, but the RLA --

MR. BUNSHAFT: It looks like those grades go down -- the housing scatters down, maybe 30, 40 feet; so if you came to the school from the housing, you would be looking up at that.

MR. FRY: Yes, and this is one of the important (issues) and features of this, because the school is actually the fore-front for the town center. So you see our school stepped in this fashion, which anticipates what is happening here in terms of the final arrival, and this is one of the reasons why we have done a staircase-type of proposition. We have related this wing with this (indicating), the buildings here in the town center as illustrated. This is our school site, and this is the plaza recreational deck, represented by this (indicating). We have represented this wing for continuity, and we have swung this around and related this wing with the parallel housing below -- row houses, two and three story.

And in essence, what I wanted to really mention was

that we had considered this central area that we have developed here as the focal point for the school and the community. Now, remember that we have our circulation pattern in this direction, and we have a circulation pattern up through the school in this direction, this crossroads point; and we are developing this crossroads point in with all these, relating off these various levels within this complex. I can show you that from the plan, but you can see the reason for this whole thing arises from the circulation pattern. Now, in here (indicating) you go across the mall to the historic site, which is located here. And this direction, at this point, is one of the major proposed ways into the center -- that would be from here, coming up here; and we have related that major pedestrian circulation with our entrance here from this direction, with the entrance from this direction, and with the entrance from below at this crossroads point. And this map sums up all of that. This is the proposed easement (indicating), which is -- this is the school; this is our central core area that I mentioned, and this is the proposed easement, proposed pedestrian access from this housing below into our school. This is the plaza development that lineally connects the historic site from the areas across here, and as the southern edge of the town center. And we have related to that in terms of the location of the building and the internal devel-

opment of it. I could go inside the building to expand on that.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think questions arise -- very difficult to understand the circulation of the building.

MRS. SMITH: Under this one had the main --

MR. FRY: This is that entrance from the lowest level, and parking (indicating). This next level here is the plaza level. This is the plaza. Now this is our building line here, and I was talking about this 60 feet across here; but we have come under our building with a portion of this plaza.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Are you tight on the other side? You can't move this project and really make a plaza.

MR. FRY: Actually we are on the property line here (indicating); we are on the property line here; and we are on the -- this side. Now we are around 12 to 15 feet from the property line. These are property lines that we have to respect as typical property lines.

MR. ROCHE: The Fort Lincoln scheme that we saw seemed to have a very specific designing intent, and the overall design, not only the site plan, but the building and the housing, and a lot of renderings that showed character. Now, is there a design coordinator coordinating what would happen in the future and what is happening in this school now, or is that responsibility yours solely, as the architect?

MR. FRY: Well, it is our responsibility to coordinate with the information that we have concerning the center and the mini-rail and so forth, and this wasn't given to us as our responsibility; but we are (fully) in touch with RLA.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Kevin is talking about architecture.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Is there a design coordinator?

MR. PURCELL: Yes, we are trying to coordinate the design between the different agencies that are there.

MRS. SAARINEN: Is there a design coordinator?

MR. PURCELL: Yes, coordinate between what they are doing and what we are doing, would be the architect and Mr. Palmer here, who calls in the different agencies to get their ideas and their designs and their drawings to coordinate with the others.

MR. ROCHE: But whoever developed the initial plan and renderings had a design intent; are they still in the picture

MR. PURCELL: They are still in the (picture); they are not prepared yet --

MR. ROCHE: But somebody designed something as far as character is concerned for Fort Lincoln. Who is taking the responsibility for seeing that this building as well as any other buildings that would go in there are in fact part of an overall design?

MR. PURCELL: Well, we are attempting to do it, but it hasn't come up as a design on the board yet.

MR. BUNSHAFT: In other words, there is nobody really dictating the character of architecture or materials, etc.; you are just doing the school here, and this architect is going to do what he thinks is appropriate?

MR. PURCELL: No, sir. In other words, each department, each agency has their own design. We are trying to follow as close as possible as to what they are going to do in the way of housing, type of architecture, and what that is not available; but we are discussing it with those people.

MR. BUNSHAFT: But there isn't one architect appointed by all these agencies to get unity?

MR. PURCELL: No, sir, there hasn't been anybody.

MR. BUNSHAFT: In other words, what you have here is a series of agencies trying in a hell of a rush to build a lot of things, to have their own lots, and have talked to each other.

MR. PURCELL: Everybody is trying to go like mad, but the school is the first project.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We are trying to understand if there is any character.

MR. ROCHE: In that case, what happened to the original planners?

MR. PURCELL: I haven't seen any schematics on any of those.

MR. ROCHE: Who is responsible for all that -- for seeing that -- who is representing the overall project?

MR. PALMER: Arnold (Mayes) is the Senior Project Coordinator for Fort Lincoln. All of this is processed through him for design.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Is he an architect?

MR. PALMER: He is an administrator.

MR. BUNSHAFT: So what you are saying is that the coordination of administration and all headaches of building a town are being handled by an administrator but there hasn't been any architect to help give some unity to this -- to help give chaos.

MR. FRY: I understand -- I had assumed that during the process of review of this by RLA this kind of thing would be reviewed, because this is the kind of thing I hoped to get a coordination with during the process of further development of this. As you can see, we have basically kept the same concept from the original planning stage, but we had hoped to coordinate in detail during these sort of considerations of the plan.

MR. ROCHE: This very much relates to the scale of this building and the materials used for character and everything

else, and seems to me there should be an overall design coordinator you could work with and would be responsible as the other projects come along.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You can do it -- otherwise -- just like everything else is going to do in the United States-- a mess.

MRS. SAARINEN: That is right. For instance, the desirability of widening this mall could never happen, because everybody is (building, piddling) his own thing without --

MR. ROCHE: First, the initial presentation of Fort Lincoln is not a real thing.

MR. PURCELL: It really should be RLA who would do this coordination and assign such a man onto this.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, it is a marvelous opportunity to build and coordinate a community within certain disciplines that allow enough freedom for each architect to enrich the community, but within disciplines, architectural disciplines; and I don't think that exists, no matter how good your project is.

Anyhow, could I ask a question? This program, I gather, is rather free and trying to be open in both education I guess, as well as giving you freedom. This could have been conceived as a less complex building, couldn't it, if one wanted to?

MR. FRY: Yes, to achieve the open planning goals, it could have.

MR. BUNSHAFT: For example, this is in a way a top of a hill for a community living around one side of it, and my impression of this is, this is a smaller scale than the houses that are down the hill, or the same scale -- very small elements. And then in an old fashioned way, up at the top of the hill in the olden days, you have the chapel or the manor house or something -- there was something there, kind of a focal (point). Seems to me, looking up at the top of the hill would be nicer for the scale of that area that this would be a slightly stronger mass. I don't mean to make it a great heroic thing, but there could be a feeling that this is the community, not a group of houses stuck together. Slightly stronger -- not by that I mean to make a fortress out of it, but slightly stronger. But I thought -- I don't know -- I don't know enough about the program, what makes it so complex is this architecture or --

MR. FRY: Two things went into it. One was an attempt-- this is in essence, which is the second floor which corresponds to this level (indicating) -- that in essence is one room. This is that floor plan. Now I could have made this --

MR. BUNSHAFT: You could call it one room, and you can call it a little alleyway or (plaza), it is still a --

(inaudible) -- let's talk about what is real.

MR. FRY: Theoretically, in terms of implementing the educational program, I could have made it one room, a warehouse type of a proposition. But what I would like to try to do here is to, in essence, have the openness of one area to implement the educational program, but to break down this interior space (indicating) into alcove areas. So that is really basically -- what you see here is actually one of these small group instructio*tary* areas.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Come around to my side here; take a look at this end here (pointing) with the stairs that solid and windows, and up above a very complex -- there could be a degree, I don't know if one felt it because it is up on top of the hill, to have all of the fun, but sort of get a little greater strength in all the elements. It has no definition -- in fact, looks like a resort.

MR. FRY: This was a conscious attempt on our part to break down this scale -- maybe we have gone too far -- but it was a conscious attempt to break this thing down, because we have, in essence, 350 feet here (indicating). This could be very simple, or it could be simplified, even here (indicating), if you can see this kind of an elevation -- this whole idea of dropping this gym down, just to simplify the thing -- the

railings and so forth would be simply handled as unifying feature on the thing. Now, we can go a little bit more in that direction but we had taken the position that basically we are talking about plain brick wall areas, and we were trying to relieve that in a distance of 350 feet.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I have a feeling of a small town up at the top of the hill, and I don't suggest you make a nice big rectangle -- but there is a stream, there is something in between this. We are just exploring -- it is my personal feeling, not the Committee's.

MRS. SAARINEN: What is nice about it -- nice curving around -- maybe if that sort of idea was strengthened without being quite as broken up -- it was crowning the hilltop with this penetration through --

MR. FRY: This could be accomplished.

MR. ROCHE: I would like to suggest -- I don't know what the procedures would be with respect to getting this overall consultant involved -- but I would like to suggest, inasmuch as we don't have that at this time, that at least the initial parts of the housing project, as it was conceived in the original plan, should be included in this model so you can see and we can see how these relate to each other. Because this is one of our problems -- we are looking at an isolated building

in what is in fact part of an overall complex.

MR. FRY: We have indicated from the studies that have been made where this housing is.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Of course there is a fundamental thing here, completion (conflict) target, things, for what they want to do, and trying to build a new community. It is almost academi it is too bad. To spend $4.5 million in 18 months, including doing design and making drawings -- quite a trick. I imagine each one is having a mad race -- like four divisions going to war, just the generals meet occasionally. Anyhow, you have heard our sort of (problem). I think being on the hill you have a responsibility not only to make the life-enriching experience in the structure, but also to relate the structures and masses and things to the environment it is in; and I think the (whole) scale is not quite resolved. I am not sure you agree, Kevin.

MR. ROCHE: There is another aspect that concerns me. This is getting back to the point where we started this conversation, which has to do with the educational program, and that is again, what happens in these kinds of situations if you don't have a fully-developed program and you design something and make assumptions and by the time the school gets to be used, you are dealing with different principals, different teachers, different teaching methods and different administrators and

suddenly find yourself with a machine which the drivers haven't learned how to use, want to create a different thing; and if you are working without a specific educational program, it is a serious problem.

MR. FRY: May I address myself to that point? We have taken that into consideration, and actually the spaces that we are providing could, in essence, serve this particular educational program as being developed, or just in an opposite approach in the future. We are providing a universal bridge in this thing -- I didn't bring the structure to indicate this -- we have a universal bridge throughout, in which case we have attempted to provide utilities in, and it is on a 10-foot by 10-foot margin, so all of these utilities are demountable and any of this can be taken out.

We have attempted to reflect this fact of changing educational ideas and concepts. Even the educational program they will come up with could be changed in five years, so that we feel that we have accomplished this kind of flexibility or convertibility for future choices. And this just happens to be one illustration, this point of time, as to how this thing could be related. But any of this could come out.

MR. ROCHE: Well, that is very good to know.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, we hope that our discussions

with you have been of some help to present our point of view and to question and probe; and we know that you have got a great deal more to do on it, and we will be happy to be of any help we can in the future. Thank you very much.

We are going to look at the Park --

MR. PURCELL: With the Commission's approval, could I ask RLA, on this question of assigning someone --

MRS. SAARINEN: Let us discuss this for a minute and --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We will inform you. You can tell them we feel strongly about it.

(Messrs. Purcell and Fry leave the room.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I prefer to write a letter to RLA.

MRS. SAARINEN: It isn't that he shouldn't say it, but we should say it officially.

MR. ROCHE: And any (professions) of that should be made by the (Chairman).

CHAIRMAN WALTON: A design coordinator should be present at least. Simple thing is, they have, I suppose, some kind of an administrative coordinator but not a design coordinator.

MRS. SAARINEN: And it was kind of an easy, innocuous character that could be worked more --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: If the Commission agrees, we will

write such a letter, very strong one, saying they must have a design coordinator.

MR. BUNSHAFT: They will -- they have to hire a consulting firm of architects, not just architect and their staff -- this is a tremendous job.

MR. ROCHE: Shouldn't it be the guys who developed the original (plan)?

MRS. SAARINEN: And we should recommend that that is who they should get.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Crane would get through making up his mind by the time they are moved into the school. I will bet they are making time and to hell with design -- that is what this sounds like. Fundamental thing is, there ought to be a coordinating firm, not architect -- not firm -- is the word.

MR. ROCHE: It is the whole real estate package here.

2. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

(b. Center Town Center Park, Eye St. Between 3rd and 6th Sts., S.W. - Revised Design)

MR. ATHERTON: Mr. Sherman is here, and he is aware of the problems on this thing. They don't even have a decision on this thing yet, on how this thing is going to be developed.

(Discussion off the record.)

6 June 1969

Dear Mr. Mister:

This is merely to confirm my conversation with Mr. Arnold Mays, Senior Project Director of Fort Lincoln development, in which I told him of the Commission's interest in seeing an overall architectural coordinator for the Fort Lincoln project. In reviewing the elementary school design at our April meeting, it was obvious that because of the number of agencies involved, and the unique quality of the entire project, it's going to be absolutely essential to have one person in charge of coordinating design. I should emphasize that this is apart from the normal coordinating activity such as scheduling and other administrative responsibilities. In other words, the sole responsibility of the job should be limited to the area of design. The Commission hopes that the Redevelopment Land Agency can secure a highly qualified person at the earliest possible time.

tary

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Melvin A. Mister
Executive Director
D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency
1420 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

EXHIBIT I

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

~~22~~ 23 April 1969

AM
10:00

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Date of Next Meeting: 21 May, 10:00 a.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of March Meeting

3. Nominations for Appointment to the Old Georgetown Panel (Wynant D. Vanderpool, Jr.; G. Revell Michael, Jr.)

III. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

1. I. M. Pei

tary

Robert F. Kennedy Grave Site, Arlington National Cemetery - Revised Design

2. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

a. Parcels 19 and 20, Maryland Ave. between 6th and 7th Sts., S.W. - Revised Design

b. Center Town Center Park, Eye St. between 3rd and 6th Sts., S.W. - Revised Design

c. L'Enfant Plaza, East Building, 10th St., S.W. - Revised Design

3. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Fort Lincoln School - Proposed Design

4. D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development

Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 69-46, 1400 22nd St., N.W., Proposed Office Building - Revised Design

b. S.L. 69-47, 515 20th St., N.W., Proposed Parking Garage - Revised Design

c. Appendix 1

Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 69-130, 1665 Wisconsin Ave., N.W. - Raze

b. O.G. 69-131, 1667 Wisconsin Ave., N.W. - Raze

IV. LEGISLATION

1. H.J. Res. 599-3/25/69-Mr. Roybal-91st C

To provide for the establishment of a fitting memorial in the Nation's Capital to the American space program and to the brave and dedicated individuals who carry it forward.

2. H.R. 262, H.R. 2191, H.R. 2194, H.R. 2386 - Budget Bureau-91st C

D.C. Parking Bills

tary

V. INTERVIEWS

12:00 1. I. M. Pei

Robert F. Kennedy Grave Site, Arlington National Cemetery - Revised Design

12:30 2. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

a. Parcels 19 and 20, Maryland Ave. between 6th and 7th Sts., S.W. - Revised Design

b. Center Town Center Park, Eye St. Between 3rd and 6th Sts., S.W. - Revised Design

c. L'Enfant Plaza, East Building, 10th St., S.W. - Revised Design

1:00 3. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Fort Lincoln School - Proposed Design

1:15 4. D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development

a. S.L. 69-45, 1400 22nd St., N.W. - Proposed Office Building - Revised Design

b. S.L. 69-47, 515 20th St., N.W., Proposed Parking Garage - Revised Design

great.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All right. It has been approved.

Now, Charly, the interviews.

MR. ATHERTON. You want to get to the interviews?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: RLA has indicated they are in favor of getting an architectural coordinator. They have asked us to make suggestions, and we are declining to make suggestions as improper.

V. INTERVIEWS

1. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

a. Selection of an Architectural Coordinator for Fort Lincoln

b. Fort Lincoln Elementary School - Revised Design

MR. ATHERTON: Mr. Mays and Mr. Sherman are from the RLA and wanted to talk before all of the rest of them come in about this architectural consultant problem.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We feel strongly that we cannot recommend people to you for this.

MR. SHERMAN: We understand that, Mr. Chairman. It was a question of whether names that have occurred to us might also have occurred to you, on an informal basis.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think we have to opt out even on an informal expression about individuals. It puts us in an impossible situation.

MR. SHERMAN: Could you at least give some indi-

EXHIBIT I

cation as to your response to the method, if not to the name?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Methods, we can discuss ad infinitum.

MR. SHERMAN: Has Mr. Atherton had a chance to discuss with you the method that we plan to use?

MR. ATHERTON: I didn't get into this in detail. But I mentioned that the consultant would work on an advisory basis to a professional staff.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes. Does that strike you as going some way toward answering the point made at your April meeting about need for a coordinating architect?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Do you want to respond, Kevin?

MR. ROCHE: I think the consultant, if he is working on that arrangement, ought to be responsible for design and, in fact, ought to appear each time an element of the plan is being presented, he ought to appear and make a presentation and be fully responsible.

MR. MAYS: My name is Arnold Mays. Perhaps I could briefly sketch out to you what I had told Charly previously about how we envision the role design is to play in the development of Fort Lincoln. We recognize that because of the sensitive nature of the type of project and the objectives that we are going to be seeking here, that design is going to play a very critical element, and it is out intention to try to make it as integral a part of the entire development process as possible.

So we are planning to set up a coordinating architect and to submit him with a staff that will be part of the Development Agency Staff there. So that the design inputs could be fed right into all of the other development aspects there. The funcion of the coordinating architect would be three fold:

He would, number one, establish with the design staff the general design criterias, general framework in which the private developers and the public buildings could take place. We would hope to have a generalized site development plan with certain site development principles as we have shown in here throughout the whole project, something that would be worked out in a combination between design and economics and housing programs and everything else. That would be a buildable package, and this we would give out to developers, and he would establish these general design criteria.

Secondly, he would be responsible for the design of all of the public open space and all of the public furniture and graphics and everything else, because we feel that the public open spacing is going to be the element which is going to tie all of the private developers together.

Thirdly, he would be responsible for the coordination of the private developers and public developers and the relationships between the two.

We would hope to have them play an important role in the selection of architects on the public side. We think that we have sufficient leverage to do it, at least as far as the District goes, with public schools and public buildings.

We hope that with some help from the Administration we canlikewise get some control over any GSA and Park Service design, so that not only would he be coordinating but he would have some say in who is going to design some of the public buildings there--the schools, and so forth. We think that can be achieved.

In that way, we feel that we have got all of the key elements of design in one central authority here and could be responsible in any kind of public submissions such as here or through the planning commission--would go through the Fort Lincoln coordinating architect and it would be a presentation similar to the type of presentation here. He would then explain the relationship of the particular buildings within the context of the overall design plan and let the individual architect then show how he carried out the expression of the design intent and thereby, we feel that we would have a more comprehensive approach than the last one that was here.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Gordon.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Would he establish the character of the architecture?

In other words, are some of them going to be red brick and some of exposed concrete? That is what we are really interested in. All I am saying, is would he be the boss of the character?

MR. MAYS: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That is what you are talking about.

MR. ROCHE: Yes, I feel he should be responsible for the appearance of this.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The words you use are fine. But they could also be broad administrative words. We are talking about when they get through, will it look like they had one basic concept?

MR. MAYS: We quite agree.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Would this be an architectural consulting firm?

MR. SHERMAN: Consulting firm.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Somebody of some stature who would not just be sitting down there in your place.

MR. SHERMAN: This is the name that we were seeking when we first approached this subject.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't see that there would be any harm in hearing some names, just to see the character of the men, but not make any comment on individuals.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, with all due respect, the first name that occurred was Mr. Sasaki's firm.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That sort of makes it interesting.

MR. MAYS: If he could, despite all of his time--

MR. SHERMAN: We recognize the difficulty in obtaining his services in view of all of the work he does have.

MR. BUNSHAFT: But I will be very blunt. This is more than a site plan. This is architecture.

MR. SHERMAN: We recognize that. We recognize it requires a unique firm to do it because not only does it call for architecture of the highest order but it calls for planning of the open spaces, too.

As Mr. Mays pointed out, this is an essential part of the consultant's contract. With all due respect, Mr. Roche was also thought of.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, it is kind that you thought of us all. I am sorry that you didn't include me on the list.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Walton, you haven't heard the entire list.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: But I wish to go back to my original position that we cannot consider any of the specific names, Gordon. I think my point has been well proved. We must consider this only in the abstract.

Kenvin, I think you would agree that they seem to be going down the right road. That is as much as we can say. Doesn't everyone agree with this?

MR. WALKER: Good.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Is there time?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We are very happy that you are doing it.

MR. MAYS: The timing depends upon the availability of funds, and if you have read the Washington papers over the last couple of weeks, you will see that we are having some difference of opinion with the Administration on funding. Assuming that we go--

MR. BUNSHAFT: If I just read this program right here, the next thing I read is the Fort Lincoln Elementary School, revised design.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You haven't been here for the whole meeting. So just bide your time.

MR. MAYS: We would hope to be able to implement the general plan that was submitted to thePlanning Commission in June by October of this year, which means we would get additional funds from the Federal Government at that time. Part of the budget that we are seeking from the Federal Government would include monies to bring this architect on board,and that would be one of the first things that we would do. We are trying to get a feel for the name of the individual and to work out a much more detailed working relationship than we have been able to express here so that we can get an idea of whether we are talking about a $10,000, the $50,000

or the $100,000 range--just for our own budgetary purposes. We kind of have the feeling that we are--

MR. BUNSHAFT: That is quite a range.

MR. MAYS: We have the feeling that it will probably be about $150,000 annually.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This is another subject we don't want to get involved in. But let's get these RLA projects up here now.

MR. BUNSHAFT: By that time this school will be all done.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Just don't be premature. We have been looking at it and we are going to make exactly the point that you are making. We discussed it all morning.

MR. SHERMAN: Would you prefer asking questions? Or we are prepared to proceed.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think we would rather ask questions. We obviously want to know your time schedule. Your very basic request that an architectural coordinator be appointed is very germain to this project.

MR. MAYS: Well, you have to go back somewhat into the history of the project in its division between the project No. 1 and the entire project. But briefly, project 1 was to be developed to meet the District's needs in housing and to be developed quickly for 400 units of housing plus a school to meet the needs of the families in project No. 1.

The problem was to so site a school that it would relate not only to this housing project but for the rest of the site planning and land usage that was going on for the project and to the rest of the school planning for the entire school facilities, bacause this particular building was to be an integral part of the whole school system for Fort Lincoln.

Now, the program, the target date set for project No. 1 was September 1970, at which time the housing and the school were to be completed. In order to meet that date, the planning for the school had to commence last fall with the selection of the site. As I have indicated to you previously, we are agreed about the essential nature of the importance of design and the need for a coordinating architect. However, our planning funds did not permit us to hire one. As I stated, we hoped to get implementation funds from the Federal Government by the fall of this year, at which time such an individual would be hired and the necessary supportive staff would be secured.

Recognizing that that latter time table did not jive with the former one of getting this school completed by September '70, because the design had to start in the early part of this year, the RLA undertook the supply the design coordination that was involved in relating the school to the surrounding area and to the other housing planning and to the other dominant feature of the present one, the town center

and the fort park. We have in a sense acted as sort of a surrogate to this future coordinating architect in supplying the review of the initial school design and of working with the school architect and making modifications so that it would relate to the general concept for Fort Lincoln that we have. But because of the time constraints that we are working under getting this first project finished by September '70 and the fact that we wouldn't be able to get a coordinating architect on board until the fall of this year, his role in the design of the actual building is going to be relatively small. The details of the relationships, we would hope that he would be able to work on, and that is about the extent of his role is going to be in regard to this particular school.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, we would very much like to avoid him being presented with, you know, a large section of this project.

MR. MAYS: The only thing that is really fixed in this area here is the school. All of the other things are just schematic and represent what really is the embodiment of certain principles that we have evolved to show the physical relationships, but there is no detailing of the thing and the final establishment of the relationships.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The housing will be built, too, won't it?

MR. SHERMAN: A portion. This building is under

construction.

MR. MAYS: This would hopefully be under way by the early part of next year. There is the housing in project No. 1.

MR. SHERMAN: Just to clarify project No. 1, it is a relatively small portion of this model which, in turn, is only about a third of the portion of the entire Fort Lincoln project. And it is approximately--

MR. BUNSHAFT: This is the school here, isn't it? Is there housing going to be here?

MR. SHERMAN: These happen to exist. That is included, you see here from the photograph of the site in point of fact. The only things that do exist is this under construction and those which are detached single family homes. The school as you recognize is here. Everything else is a representation of concept, activity, types of buildings, massing relationships to the contours, but no actual designs. The fort is the only exception to that, which is an attempt to restore the historic Civil War fort for the Park Service.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That will be coming up later.

MR. SHERMAN: This is, as we say, is a major project for the coordinator, the design.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The immediate problem is a school design on which we would like to drag our feet on so that the coordinating architect was there on it from the beginning,

frankly. If it isn't possible, we would like to know it.

MR. MAYS: I don't think that would be possible to meet our schedule. As I said, the agency and our design staff has attempted to coordinate this building, and there are certain constraints--topographical constraints, program constraints, street constraints--that we feel in large measure determine the general configuration of the building and its relationships, and we have tried to work that out as best we can. We feel that while another voice might have certain modifications, that there are certain basic things here that because of the site and everything else, these principles would remain.

MR. SHERMAN: Would you like for me to try to go through the design constraints as we see them?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Just a bit.

MR. SHERMAN: Briefly, there are three-the questions of the activities, the land uses that we now see and which are in the form of the land use plan prepared by the Planning Commission, and they designate the fort as a public open space, the town center with community facilities such as the school and others here. That will be described in the text. The presence of the projects which, as we call it in execution, namely, project 1 with buildings under construction and a road designed to be under construction shortly. And the topography itself, of course, which sort of goes without

saying and the street system which is a rather difficult problem in view of the serious topography. The school was meant to serve from the very beginning the immediate needs of project 1. Hopefully, one of the reasons the schedule is as tight as it is is in order to have the school open at the time that the housing for project 1 is completed.

At the same time, because of the educational program that has been worked out for the entire Fort Lincoln project area, the school was meant to be a functioning part of the entire town center. Not only is it a community activity immediately adjacent, but there will be other community activities that are serving supplemental functions to the school itself.

The street system has caused a number of problems in that once--well, this is the result of events that have taken place since the Commission requested this kind of relationship at its last meeting. We have been informed by the Highway Department of the need to separate Eastern Avenue, which is a major arterial road, from the service roads. Given their minimum standards--and we have tried to respect those at the same time as meeting the Park Service requirement for a historic site on the high point of the site in addition to the fort--we have suggested this kind of a separation because this road, the service road going into the heart of the project not only links to the town center via an underground pass but

because of the fact the school will be under capacity when project 1 is completed, there is a need for access to the site for bused-in students.

Mr. Frye, the architect of the school, is here and can discuss that in some detail with you if you so desire. So what we have so far are the land use activities, the topography, the road system, and in addition to the road system, the system of pedestrian paths which have already been established, one coming through the housing, in a sense providing a major access route through the school site to the town center, as well as a supplemental access serving the other housing of project 1.

These three major constraints--the land use, the circulation pattern which includes the Mini Rail, definitely located so as to serve the school and the town center and the topography, keeping the mass of the building low in relation to the school at the same time that will carry out the stepping arrangement of the mass so that the school is visually as well as functionally a part of the town center--have been the kinds of constraints that the architect was informed of when he began his initial plan. It is the kinds of constraints that we see the coordinating architect performing for everypublic building.

We think as a result of this, this is a demonstration of the method the coordinating architect would use.

In view of the schedule Mr. Mays has pointed out,

we would ask the Commission to act on the school itself.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It is a tough one. Do you think we should discuss this with the architect and later decide whether we want to act or not? I think it would be to our advantage to have full information, Kevin, on the building, and then discuss in private whether we wish to take any action. I think it is the kind of thing we have to do in private. Let's question the architect a little bit.

MR. FRYE: Good morning. My name is Louis Frye, Jr.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We want just a bit of additional information.

MR. FRYE: I would like to say at the beginning that we have been developing this project from the original plan that was handed to you previously plus the refinement of that program through General Learning Corporation. The building that you see here has the approval of the General Learning Corporation as implementing their ideal program.

One of the major elements in terms of the consideration of the building was this question of pedestrian accessibility, and we would try to, with the given pedestrial access points which are basically through here and here, we tried to use that as a starting point for our circulation system. And in conjunction with that we have in the central portion of our building a vertical circulation hub from which

to gain access to all parts of the building--to the ramp in that central circulation area, and that is the community and education hub for the entire school. That is this central area in here.

Now, in terms of access to the building from the low side, that access point would be, this is to here looking this direction, access from the low side would be here along a ramp that will allow you to come up in the lobby area here. This represents the housing, three story housing that would be at this lower level, to give you the scale relationship between what we are doing.

In addition to this ramp development which would allow you access without steps up to this lobby area, we have this as a plaza out in front at this point with its skating rink, outdoor dining, this kind of activity, recreational activity.

So once you get into the building at this level there is an opening here in the central spot which opens out to allow a lobby area at the upper level. This lounge and lobby area at the upper level relates to the plaza here ten feet up.

Now, in addition to that circulation system, we have a ring that comes across at the equivalent second story level that turns to the plaza here and this town center development here.

So this is the section of the building, the second floor level directly with the town center and at the first floor level, the two first floor levels, the lower and the upper levels.

Starting from the lowest level, basically, let me say that the basic community facilities are on these first two levels--that is, the swimming pool, gymnasium, administration offices, clinic, well fare offices--this type of thing on the first two levels.

Basically the educational portion is at this level here with the pre-school and kindergarten also down at the first floor level. And here is a mezzanine level which is the arts and science level off of the educational level.

That is the basic breakdown of the functions within the building. So starting from the lowest floor which would be represented by this entrance at this side, you come into this central space. You have access to the gym, auditorium and to the swimming pool by means of this plaza development I described previously.

On this side we have a ramp down to the service area where we service the boiler room, the kitchen, storage and so forth. That ramp is shown here. So that all of these service facilities are underground and are not visible.

Passing up from that level to the first floor level--

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Now, we have been through these

plans, may I point out in this simple way. I don't think we really need to go through them again. We had a session earlier this morning. I just thought that we would give you a chance to be questioned, too.

MR. FRYE: Fine.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I wonder if any of the members have questions about things that were not clear in our go-over this morning.

Mr. Roche, is there anything you want to ask?

MR. ROCHE: I have no questions. We have this other matter which relates to the whole problem.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Do you have any questions you want to ask?

MR. BUNSHAFT: No.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mrs. Smith?

MRS. SMITH: I am curious--apparently there will be eventually higher buildings--if there is any use made of the roof? I haven't seen a roof plan.

MR. FRYE: This was one of the major efforts on our part was to use the roof areas. As a matter of fact, the entire roof area is used. This lower roof about ten feet off the ground is used as an actual recreational area. The upper roof associated with the mezzanine and the educational facilities is used for educational purposes--outside study, the growing of plants, manual training, outside construction

projects, and this kind of thing for the children. We have used the entire roof area, in essence.

MRS. SMITH: Great.

MR. FRYE: This was brought about because of the small site we had and the need to have as much outdoor activity, recreational area as possible. So we have maximized the use of the roof.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Thank you very much. If there are no more questions, the Commission will take it under consideration.

MR. FRYE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: And let you know.

27 June 1969

Dear Colonel Starobin:

I would like to clear up any misunderstanding resulting from last Friday's Washington Post article about the Commission's action on the Fort Lincoln Elementary School.

Contrary to the report, the Commission did not disapprove the design. Instead, after considering the very real scheduling difficulties facing this project, the Commission waived further review of the design in the hope that this would help move the project ahead. In taking this action we also stipulated to the Redevelopment Land Agency that we would review no further projects at Fort Lincoln until they have secured the services of a highly qualified professional to coordinate the architectural design for the entire project. We understand they are in full agreement with this proposal and are ready to hire such a person. As you know, the Commission of Fine Arts strongly backs the Fort Lincoln development and sees this as an excellent opportunity to demonstrate what can be achieved in a well designed community.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Lt. Colonel Sam D. Starobin
Acting Director
Department of General Services
Room 501
601 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

EXHIBIT J

July 3, 1969

Dear Mr. Mister:

I am writing to confirm the Commission of Fine Art's action regarding the design for the Town Center Park which we reviewed at our meeting on June 19th.

We were glad to receive the model showing this park in relation to the surrounding area. It gave a much clearer picture of how the design actually will function. The Commission approved the design with a number of suggestions which we hope can be incorporated into the final drawings. Among these was the substitution of a low pool for the proposed reuse of the McMillan fountain. The fountain, in the Commission's opinion, is too dated and would not be in character with the rest of the design.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Melvin A. Mister
Executive Director
D. C. Redevelopment Land Agency
1420 New York Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

EXHIBIT K

July 3, 1969

Dear Mr. Mister:

I am writing merely to confirm the action by the Commission of Fine Arts regarding the design for Southwest Pepco Substation No. 18 which the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed at its meeting on June 19th.

The Commission is unable to comment in any specific detail because we found it difficult to understand the exact nature of the proposal, even though the architect was there to explain it. We hope that a clearer model will be presented at the next meeting of the Commission which will accurately show the relation of all existing grades, the railroad track, retaining wall, entrances to the building and the building itself.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Melvin A. Mister
Executive Director
D. C. Redevelopment Land Agency
1420 New York Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

EXHIBIT L

3 July 1969

Dear Colonel Starobin:

I would like to report to you on the status of the design studies for the Bruce-Monroe Elementary School at Georgia Avenue and Irving Street, N.W. which the Commission reviewed at its meeting on June 19th.

We felt that the plan was excellent and represented real progress in the quality of school design submitted to the Commission. However, we feel that the architect has not carried the strength of this plan into the development of the elevations and recommended a number of specific suggestions that he study. Since the Commission's meeting he has resubmitted several which I have circulated to the members for comment. As soon as these comments are available, we will be in touch with your office.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Lt. Colonel Sam D. Starobin
Acting Director
Dept. of General Services
Rm. 501
601 Indiana Ave., N.W.
Wash., DC 20004

EXHIBIT M

11 July 1969

Dear Colonel Adams:

I am writing to report the Commission of Fine Arts action on designs for the chapel at Fort Myer, which the Commission reviewed on June 19th.

We feel that the present solution is not acceptable. The connection between the sanctuary which is the principal element of the chapel, and the other related functions such as the Sunday School, etc., in the lower wing, is very awkward. A much better solution, in our view, would be to separate these two elements more clearly, allowing the main element to stand essentially free with the structural supports resting directly on grade rather than on the roof of another building as it presently appears.

We will be happy to view any new studies by the architect whenever they may be ready.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Colonel C. E. Adams, Jr.
District Engineer
Corps of Engineers
Norfolk District
Fort Norfolk, 803 Front Street
Norfolk, Va. 23510

EXHIBIT N

3 July 1969

Dear Mr. Kunzig:

This is merely to confirm the Commission of Fine Arts action on the designs for the John E. Fogarty International Center of Advanced Study in the Health Sciences at the National Institutes of Health, which we reviewed at our meeting on June 19th.

We have asked that the architect restudy the plans which seem far too complicated and, in our opinion, which neither function well or result in a good design. Mr. Obata was agreeable to making these studies and we assured him that we would be happy to review any new designs as soon as they are ready.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Robert L. Kunzig
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT O

BEFORE THE COMMISSION ON FINE ARTS

In the Matter of PENN MARKET PROPERTIES 801 Market Space, N. W. Washington, D. C.	Shipstead-Luce #50-69 58-69

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF PENN MARKET PROPERTIES

This Application is in connection with the proposed construction of a twelve-story office building at 801 Market Space. The Application has been submitted to you as required by Title 5, Section 410 of the District of Columbia Code, 1967 Edition, such Section being known as the Shipstead-Luce Act.

I have present here with me the architect, Karl Kaufman, who is available to answer inquiries concerning the height and appearance of the building or color and texture of the exterior materials.

We have also a model of the proposed structure showing it in relationship to other buildings in the surrounding area.

EXHIBIT P

Application was originally made on May 1, 1969. Mr. Kaufman and myself checked with the staff of the Commission to ascertain that the application was in order, so that no delay would occur. We were both advised that the application was correct.

On May 28, I learned that the Application had been returned with a request for a model, and on May 29 I requested the application be resubmitted to you as set forth in my letters of that date to William Walton, Chairman of the Commission, and J. Paul Green of the District of Columbia Government.

The Applicant recognizes that the proposed building does not conform with the Plan as promulgated by the President's Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue. In fact, it could not conform less, since the Plan shows this area to be devoted to a public park, and thus would require that no building be erected on this site.

However, an effort has been made on the part of the owners and architect to keep the building within the spirit of the Plan, and we have, in fact, used less than the allowable floor area ratio, setting back the building both on the Market Space and Eighth Street sides so as to provide the maximum vista of open space, consistent with the erection of a building on this site.

The owners of the property have, of course, been aware over the years of the existence of the Pennsylvania Avenue Plan, and I have

on their behalf, as their Counsel, cooperated with the President's Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue for a period in excess of four years in an effort to work out some arrangement regarding this property. This has been to no avail, and the time has come where the owners of the property feel they can in good conscience go forth with the erection of the building. If there is serious interest in acquiring this property for use in the Pennsylvania Avenue Plan, there is still time. Final plans and the final issuance of a permit will take at least six months.

We therefore ask a definitive answer from this Commission under its authority of the Shipstead-Luce Act, to grant its approval of this building. On behalf of the owners, I am authorized to state that we will make whatever changes are required in the building that are within reason. However, if a denial is to be handed down by the Commission, then let it be on the basis that this building does not, nor could any building on this site, conform with the Pennsylvania Avenue Plan, and do not let the denial be on the basis of an insignificant detail, because I assure this Commission that we will change anything in this building to meet with your requirements.

The essential question here is whether or not there will ever be a valid plan for Pennsylvania Avenue that will be implemented. The entire section of Pennsylvania Avenue under the Plan has become stagnated.

Respectfully submitted,

DANZANSKY, DICKEY, QUINT & GORDON

By

Harold Gordon

19 June 1969

Ref. S.L. 69-60

Dear Mr. Beemer:

At its June 19th meeting the Commission of Fine Arts voted unanimously against recommending approval of the design proposed for the site of the present Willard Hotel.

As you know, the Commission has previously taken a similar action and for the same reason -- that the proposed building on that site is incompatible with the plans advanced by the President's Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue. Those plans have been approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

Yours truly,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. John R. Beemer
Chief, Permit Branch
Bureau of Licenses and Inspections
Department of Economic Development
District Building
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT 9

19 June 1969

Ref: S.L. 69-58

Dear Mr. Beemer:

At its June 19th meeting the Commission of Fine Arts voted unanimously against recommending approval of the design proposed for 801 Market Space, N.W.

As you know, the Commission has previously taken a similar action and for the same reason -- that the proposed building on that site is incompatible with the plans advanced by the President's Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue. Those plans have been approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

Yours truly,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. John R. Beemer
Chief, Permit Branch
Bureau of Licenses and Inspections
Department of Economic Development
District Building
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT R

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS 6/19/69

NO SL 69-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
56	515-20th St., NW Gewirz & Small	Material samples for proposed parking garage.

ACTION: App'd., provided constr. match sample sand-blasted panels erected on the site, & also sample submitted to the CFA's office. Request that panels on site be left for duration of job, 6/9/69.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS 6/19/69

NO OG 69-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
166	3247 R St., NW Rev. & Mrs. A.R. Shands, III	Remove exist. porch & door sections. Replace with new step & door frame.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 6/18/69.	
167	1232 Potomac St., NW H. W. Porterfield	Brick veneer rear exist. bldg. Exterior changes only. Permit issued for interior.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 6/18/69.	

APPENDIX 2

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
19 June 1969

AM
10:00

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Date of Next Meeting: 17 September 1969, 10:00 a.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of April meeting

3. Informal Inquiry - Additional Street Lighting, Independence Avenue and 10th St., S.W., L'Enfant Plaza Corporation

III. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

1. D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development

a. Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) SL 69-60, 1401 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. - Proposed Office Building on Site of Willard Hotel

(2) SL 69-58, 801 Market Space, N.W. - Proposed Office Building

(3) SL 69-41, 1740 New York Ave., N.W., - Proposed Office Building for United Unions

(4) Appendix 1

b. Old Georgetown Act

Appendix 2

2. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

a. Selection of an Architectural Coordinator for Fort Lincoln

b. Fort Lincoln Elementary School - Revised Design

c. Town Center Park, Eye Street between 3rd and 6th Sts., S.W. - Revised Design

d. Southwest Pepco Substation No. 18 - Revised Design

3. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Bruce-Monroe Elementary School Replacement, Georgia Avenue and Irving St., N.W. - Proposed Design

4. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

a. Fort Myer, Va. Interfaith Chapel - Proposed Design

b. Relocation of:

(1) Wall, Arlington National Cemetery, Old Horseshow Grounds

(2) Proposed Closing of Arlington Ridge Road and Relocation of Sheridan Gate

c. Army Mutual Aid Building, Fort Myer - Proposed Design

5. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

John E. Fogarty International Center of Advanced Study in the Health Sciences, National Institute of Health - Proposed Design

6. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

Electrical Substation for Subway, Rock Creek Park and Belmont Road - Proposed Design

7. Treasury Department, Bureau of the Mint

a. South Carolina Tricentennial Medal - Proposed Design
b. Alabama 150th Anniversary Medal - Proposed Design
b. Medal Commemorating the 100th Anniversary of the City of Wichita - Confirmation of Action

8. Department of the Army, Institute of Heraldry

"Apollo" Moon Lapel Button - Confirmation of Action

IV. LEGISLATION

1. S.J. Res. 94-4/18/69-Mr. Proxmire-91st C

To provide for a professional study of the feasibility of restoring the west front of the Capitol, with particular attention to and analysis of the risk, cost, and disruption factors of a restoration project.

2. S.J. Res. 24-1/22/69-Mr. Jackson-91st C

To provide for the administration and development of Pennsylvania Avenue as a national historic site.

3. H.R. 10238-4/17/69-Mr.Arends-91st C

To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the removal of the Francis Asbury statue, and for other purposes.

V. INTERVIEWS

V. INTERVIEWS

11:30 1. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

a. Selection of an Architectural Coordinator for Fort Lincoln

b. Fort Lincoln Elementary School - Revised Design

c. Town Center Park, Eye Street between 3rd and 6th Sts., S.W. - Revised Design

d. Southwest Pepco Substation No. 18 - Revised Design

12:00 2. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Bruce-Monroe Elementary School Replacement, Georgia Avenue and Irving St., N.W. - Proposed Design

12:15 3. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

a. Fort Myer, Va. Interfaith Chapel - Proposed Design

b. Army Mutual Aid Building, Fort Myer - Proposed Design

12:45 4. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

John E. Fogarty International Center of Advanced Study in the Health Sciences, National Institutes of Health - Proposed Design

1:00 5. D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development

a. S.L. 69-60 , 1401 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. - Proposed Office Building on Site of Willard Hotel

b. SL 69-58, 801 Market Space, N.W. - Proposed Office Building

c. SL 69-59, 1740 New York Ave., N.W., Proposed "United Unions" Office Building